

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 179813

11  
ORIGIN EUR-03

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /004 R

66011  
DRAFTED BY:EUR/RPM:ESCAMPBELL  
APPROVED BY:EUR/RPM:ESCAMPBELL  
----- 083497

R 200245Z JUL 76  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
INFO AMEMBASSY OSLO 0000

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 179813

FOL REPEAT USNATO 4049 ACTION SECSTATE INFO COPENHAGEN LONDON  
MOSCOW OTTAWA GENEVA JULY 19, 1976

QUOTE

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 4049

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: ECON, SENV, CSCE, ECE, NATO, DA  
SUBJ: ECONADS: DISCUSSION OF DANISH PROPOSAL FOR ARCTIC  
CONSTRUCTION SYMPOSIUM

REF: (A) STATE 150840 (NOTAL), (B) USNATO 3759 (NOTAL), (C)  
STATE 173524 (NOTAL)

SUMMARY: IN JULY 15 ECONADS DISCUSSION OF DANISH  
PROPOSAL, UK REPORTED IT HAD ALREADY TABLED SIMILAR  
PROPOSAL IN ECE CONTEXT AND WOULD PREFER NOT TO HAVE  
DUPLICATION BETWEEN THE TWO. CANADA, WHILE AGREEING  
WITH THE DANISH PROPOSAL IN PRINCIPLE, NEVERTHELESS  
POINTED OUT A NUMBER OF PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE  
ISSUES WHICH RAISED QUESTION AS TO THE DESIRABILITY  
OF PROCEEDING WITHOUT FURTHER CAREFUL PREPARATION.  
DANISH REP SAID HE WOULD REPORT DISCUSSION TO  
COPENHAGEN AND SEEK FRESH INSTRUCTIONS - HOPEFULLY  
IN TIME FOR JULY 22 ECONADS MEETING. ACTION REQUESTED:  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 179813

GUIDANCE IN LIGHT OF APPARENTLY PRE-EMPTIVE UK  
PROPOSAL AND CANADIAN CONCERNS. END SUMMARY.

1. AT JULY 15 ECONADS DISCUSSION OF DANISH

PROPOSAL DETAILED REF B, US (PER REF C) AND NORWEGIAN (BULL) REPS CONFIRMED THEIR AUTHORITIES' INITIAL POSITIVE REACTION GIVEN TO DANISH EMBASSIES IN WASHINGTON AND OSLO.

2. UK REP (DOBLE) POINTED OUT THAT THE BRITISH HAD ALREADY TABLED A VERY SIMILAR PROPOSAL AT THE ECE AND HENCE WOULD PREFER NOT TO HAVE DUPLICATION OF THEIR INITIATIVE. SUBSEQUENTLY, THE UK ECONAD PROVIDED US WITH THE FOLLOWING UNCLASSIFIED TEXT, UNDATED, WHICH HE HAD RECEIVED FROM THE FCO IN LONDON.  
BEGIN TEXT:

UNECE: CO-OPERATION IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
(PROPOSAL FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM DELEGATION)

1. THE SENIOR ADVISORS TO ECE GOVERNMENTS ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AGREED AT THEIR LAST MEETING THAT THEY WOULD CONTINUE TO FOSTER CO-OPERATION IN THE ECE REGION IN SELECTED FIELDS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY THROUGH MEETINGS OF EXPERTS, SEMINARS AND CONFERENCES. IN RESPONSE TO THIS GENERAL AIM AND TO THE SPIRIT OF INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION THAT WAS GENERATED BY THE HELSINKI CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE, THE UNITED KINGDOM PROPOSES THAT COLLABORATION SHOULD BE INITIATED WITHIN UNECE IN THE FIELDS OF THE ARCTIC, TRANSPORT TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE. IT IS PROPOSED THAT COLLABORATION IN THESE FIELDS SHOULD TAKE PLACE, AS DISCUSSED BELOW, THROUGH MEETINGS OF EXPERTS AND SEMINARS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRACTICE THAT IS WELL ESTABLISHED IN UNECE.

THE ARCTIC: INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF RESEARCH  
AND DEVELOPMENT

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03     STATE 179813

2. THE ARCTIC HAS BECOME ONE OF THE FOCAL POINTS FOR THE RESOLUTION OF PROBLEMS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, CONSERVATION, POLLUTION AND IMPACT ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES WHICH ARE NOW AROUSING NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INTEREST. WHAT HAPPENS IN THE ARCTIC CONCERNS NOT ONLY THOSE STATES WITH ARCTIC LANDS BUT ALSO COUNTRIES LOCATED FURTHER SOUTH.

3. THE CENTRAL PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN RELATING TO INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE ARCTIC IS THE POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT CONSIDERED IN THE WIDEST SENSE. RECENT EVENTS HAVE SHOWN THAT WIDELY DIFFERING OPINIONS EXIST ABOUT

THE POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT;  
THAT ENVIRONMENTAL AND FINANCIAL COSTS OF TECHNOLOGICAL MISTAKES WOULD TEND TO BE MUCH GREATER THAN IN MORE TEMPERATE LATITUDES AND THAT MANY OF THE NECESSARY RESEARCH PROGRAMMES, BEING BEYOND THE MEANS OF ANY ONE COUNTRY, REQUIRE INTERNATIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND CO-OPERATION.

4. IT IS PROPOSED THAT A SYMPOSIUM SHOULD BE HELD WITHIN THE UNECE TO IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ALL THOSE CONCERNED WITH ARCTIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND TO CONSIDER THE SCOPE THERE MIGHT BE FOR ENCOURAGING INFORMATION EXCHANGES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS AND SCIENTISTS ON PLANNED RESEARCH PROJECTS AND THEIR RESULT.  
END TEXT.

3. CANADAIN REP (HERMAN) MADE STATEMENT WHICH CITED A NUMBER OF PROCEDURAL, PRACTICAL, AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS HE AND HIS AUTHORITIES SAW IN THE DANISH PROPOSAL. HE CIRCULATED THE TEXT AT THE CLOSE OF THE MEETING AND, BECAUSE OF ITS POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR INTRA-ALLIED CSCE COORDINATION, WE QUOTE IT BELOW.

BEGIN TEXT:  
MY AUTHORITIES WERE, OF COURSE, PLEASED TO DISCUSS WITH THE DANISH GOVERNMENT THEIR PROPOSAL FOR CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04     STATE 179813

AN EXCHANGE OF VIEWS, THROUGH THE VEHICLE OF A SYMPOSIUM, ON EXPERIENCES CONCERNING CONDITIONS RELATED TO VARIOUS ASPECTS OF ARCTIC DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS, IN OUR VIEW, AN OBVIOUS EXAMPLE OF THE DANISH DESIRE TO EXTEND CO-OPERATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CSCE FINAL ACT AND IT IS THE TYPE OF INITIATIVE TO WHICH WE SHOULD ALL BE GIVEN CAREFUL CONSIDERATION.

IN GIVING SUCH INITIATIVES OUR CONSIDERATION, HOWEVER, WE SHOULD NOT BE AFRAID TO ASK OURSELVES THE SEARCHING QUESTIONS WHICH CARRY WITH THEM IDEAS ON THE WIDER POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF ALL OF OUR ACTIONS. INDEED, IN CONVEYING TO MY AUTHORITIES THE TEXT OF THE LETTER OF JUNE 29TH FROM OUR DANISH COLLEAGUE I RAISED SOME QUESTIONS MYSELF IF FOR NO OTHER PURPOSE THAN TO GIVE MYSELF PAUSE FOR THOUGHT.

IN THE STRICT TERMS OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL EXCHANGES, THE DANISH PROPOSAL WOULD SEEM TO POINT TO AN ACCEPTABLE DIRECTION AS FAR AS DEVELOPMENT OF CO-OPERATION IS CONCERNED, AS THOSE COUNTRIES WITH EXTENSIVE POLAR REGIONS (PARTICULARLY THE USSR) WOULD BE INTERESTED IN

LEARNING HOW OTHERS COPE WITH THE COMMON PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH ARCTIC DEVELOPMENT. THE QUESTION IS, WOULD WE WANT TO MOVE OUTSIDE ESTABLISHED FORA SUCH AS THE ECE OR OECD TO CONSIDER SUCH EXCHANGES, PARTICULARLY WHEN A SYMPOSIUM ALONG THE LINES OF THE DANISH SUGGESTION MIGHT CUT ACROSS OTHER WORK IN OTHER BODIES (I.E. THE ECE PRINCIPAL SUBSIDIARY BODIES, NON-GOVERNMENTAL/ACADEMIC GATHERINGS, BILATERAL COMMISSIONS, ETC.). IF THE PROPOSED SYMPOSIUM IS TO BE TAKEN IN THE CSCE CONTEXT, WOULD OTHER CSCE PARTICIPANTS BE ABLE TO ATTEND IF THEY WISH, OR WOULD ATTENDANCE BE STRICTLY LIMITED TO THE DANISH LIST?

WE HAVE SUCCEEDED TO A DEGREE IN DAMPENING THE SOVIET INITIATIVES (BREZHNEV PROPOSALS) TO CONVENE CONFERENCES ON ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND ENERGY. IF WE WERE NOW TO SUPPORT A NEW INITIATIVE OF SOMEWHAT THE SAME CHARACTER, WOULD WE NOT BE LAYING OURSELVES OPEN TO CRITICISM (PARTICULARLY BY THE USSR) IN A GENERAL SENSE THROUGH SUCH "SELECTIVITY OF SUPPORT". IN THIS INSTANCE YOU WILL NOTE THAT THE USSR  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05      STATE 179813

STANDS ALONE AMONG A NUMBER OF NEUTRALS AND ALLIES.

AS FAR AS OVERALL CSCE FOLLOW-UP IS CONCERNED, HOW WILL WE COPE WITH THE POTENTIAL PROLIFERATION OF INFORMAL MULTILATERAL GATHERINGS? I AM NOT SUGGESTING WE SHOULD BE AFRAID TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE EAST (OR THE NEUTRALS) MULTILATERALLY BUT RATHER THAT IT MIGHT BE DIFFICULT TO ADEQUATELY RECORD AND ASSESS CSCE RESULTS FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW (WITH BELGRADE 77 APPROACHING) IF OUR EFFORTS ARE BEING FRAGMENTED INTO NUMEROUS INFORMAL FORA. THAT IS NOT TO SAY THAT THE DANISH PROPOSAL SHOULD BE REJECTED OUT OF HAND FOR THIS REASON ALONE. IT COULD BE A VEHICLE OF PARCTICAL CO-OPERATION IN THE SPIRIT OF THE CSCE. WE COULD, HOWEVER, NOW CONSIDER WHETHER WE WISH TO SEE SUCH A TREND OF MULTILATERAL CO-OPERATIVE FORA PROLIFERATE OR WHETHER WE WISH TO MORE SHARPLY CONCENTRATE OUR EFFORTS.

AS DESCRIBED IN MR. ANDERSEN'S LETTER, THE CANADIAN REACTION TO THE DANISH PROPOSAL HAS BEEN A POSITIVE RESPONSE IN PRINCIPLE FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF OVERALL CSCE AND SCIENTIFIC VALUE TO BE DERIVED. WE DO HAVE TWO RESERVATIONS. THE FIRST IS A RELUCTANCE TO PROVIDE THE USSR WITH INFORMATION ON THE ARCTIC WITHOUT RECIPROCITY ON THEIR PART. THE SECOND RELATES TO THE FACT THAT IN 1971 CANADA SPONSORED A SIMILAR PROPOSAL WHICH DIED IN THE LATE PLANNING STAGES BECAUSE OF LACK OF SOVIET CO-OPERATION. THE NORWEGIANS TOOK UP THE CUDGEL AGAIN IN 1973 ONLY TO MEET A SIMILAR FATE.

MY AUTHORITIES DO NOT SEE AN INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN DEFLECTING THE BREZHNEV PROPOSALS AND ACCEPTING THE DANISH PROPOSAL IN PRINCIPLE. THE BREZHNEV PROPOSALS

COULD BE MAJOR INITIATIVES DEMANDING POLITICAL DECISIONS BEFORE TECHNICAL WORK IS BEGUN. THE SOVIETS CONSIDER THAT "THOUSANDS" WILL BE INVOLVED AND PROJECTS WILL BE OF A LONG TERM NATURE. ALL CSCE STATES ARE INVITED AND THE SOVIETS SPEAK OF ESTABLISHMENT OF SOME KIND OF A PERMANENT SECRETARIAT. THESE WOULD OBVIOUSLY BE COSTLY CONFERENCES, REQUIRING CONSULTATION AND PREPARATION AND ADVANCE AGREEMENT ON FINANCING. THE DANISH PROPOSAL WOULD SEEM TO BE MORE OF AN EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION, PROBABLY A ONE TIME AFFAIR WITH RELATIVELY FEW PARTICIPANTS. NO  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06     STATE 179813

ELABORATE MECHANISM IS REQUIRED NOR MAJOR POLITICAL DECISIONS. FINANCING WOULD PROBABLY PRESENT ONLY A MINOR PROBLEM. PRE-

SUMABLY THE USSR WOULD SEE ADVANTAGE IN OBTAINING INFORMATION ON THE ARCTIC AND MAY EVEN CONTRIBUTE TO SUCH AN EXCHANGE PROVIDED NO SOCIOLOGICAL QUESTIONS WERE ON THE AGENDA.

THE DANISH PROPOSAL DOES GIVE CAUSE FOR REFLECTION ON THE NATURE OF CSCE MULTILATERAL IMPLEMENTATION. THE NATURE OF UNILATERAL AND BILATERAL IMPLEMENTATION IS CLEAR IN THE FINAL ACT. THE NORMAL IMPLICATINN OF MULTILATERAL IMPLICATION IS THAT ALL PARTICIPATING STATES BE INVITED TO ATTEND A FORUM OR THE LIKE. THE QUESTION WHICH THE DANISH PROPOSAL ADVANCES IS, CAN THERE BE A MULTILATERAL CSCE INITIATIVE WHICH DOES NOT INCLUDE AN INVITATION TO ALL 35 STATES.

THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION SHOULD BE "YES-WITH QUALIFICATION". JUST AS THERE CAN BE BILATERAL AGREEMENTS UNDER THE CSCE, WE SEE NO REASON WHY THERE CANNOT BE A MULTILATERAL APPROACH WHICH INCLUDED THREE, FOUR OR MORE STATES. IN OUR VIEW MEETINGS WOULD NOT HAVE TO INCLUDE STATES FROM BOTH EAST AND WEST. TO ENSURE THESE KINDS OF PROPOSALS SATISFIED THE CONDITIONS FOR CSCE IMPLEMENTATION, WE WOULD ENVISAGE THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA BEING MET: THE MEETING SHOULD FOCUS ON SPECIFIC PROVISION(S) OF INTEREST ONLY TO THE PARTICULAR STATES INVOLVED. THE RECENT MEETING OF BALKAN STATES WAS OF THIS NATURE; SO, TOO, THE DANISH PROPOSAL. WE HARDLY THINK THE MALTESE, FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD BE INTERESTED IN A TECHNICAL STUDY ON THE ARCTIC AND WE WOULD SEE NO NEED FOR THEM TO BE INVITED. ON THE OTHER HAND, CSCE RULES SEEM TO IMPLY THAT ALL STATES BE INVITED WITH THE DECISION ON WHETHER TO ATTEND LEFT TO EACH STATE.

A WAY TO MEET THIS WOULD BE TO INFORM ALL 35 STATES THAT THE INITIATIVE BEING UNDERTAKEN INCLUDES A SPECIFIC NUMBER OF STATES ONLY, WITH OTHER STATES NOT INVITED. SHOULD OTHERS HAVE A STRONG DESIRE TO ATTEND, THEIR PRESENCE WOULD BE WELCOMED PROVIDED THEY PAID A PRO-RATED SHARE OF THE COSTS OF HOLDING A CONFERENCE, UNLESS THE HOST

STATE DECIDES TO PAY ALL OF THE COSTS.  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07     STATE 179813

WHEN A MEETING IS FOCUSING ON BROAD SECTIONS  
OR PRINCIPLES OF THE FINAL ACT, WE THINK ALL STATES SHOULD  
BE INVITED TO ATTEND. WE VIEWED, FOR EXAMPLE, THE MEETING  
OF THE CRE IN TRIESTE IN THAT LIGHT. THIS WAS A MEETING  
OF A SEMI-PRIVATE ORGANIZATION WHERE RECTORS FROM DIFFERENT  
UNIVERSITIES IN EUROPE GATHERED TO DISCUSS, AMONGST OTHER  
THINGS, IMPLEMENTATION OF BASKET III QUESTIONS ON EDUCATION.  
OUR VIEW WAS THAT THE NATURE OF DISCUSSION WAS OF BROAD  
INTEREST TO ALL PARTICIPATING STATES. WE CONSIDERED IT  
A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE THAT ANY INTERESTED STATE BE INVITED  
TO PARTICIPATE AS A FULL MEMBER. IT MAY BE WORTHWHILE TO  
HAVE THE BELGRADE MEETING SET UP A SERIES OF GUIDELINES  
ALONG THE LINES SUGGESTED ABOVE FOR LIMITED PARTICIPATION  
IN MULTILATERAL INITIATIVES. WE WOULD WELCOME THE COMMENTS  
OF OUR NATO ALLIES ON THESE QUESTIONS AND WE HOPE THAT  
SOME OF THE IDEAS RAISED WILL BE OF ASSISTANCE TO OUR  
DANISH FRIENDS.  
END TEXT.

4. IN RESPONSE TO SOME OF THE POINTS MADE IN THE

CANADIAN STATEMENT, THE DANISH REP (ANDERSEN) SAID  
HIS AUTHORITIES FORESAW A MEETING OF RATHER LIMITED  
SIZE, PERHAPS 30 PARTICIPANTS, LASTING TEN TO 14  
DAYS. NEITHER THE CANADIAN NOR NORWEGIAN REPS  
HAD FURTHER DETAILS ON THE EARLIER INITIATIVES  
DESCRIBED.

5. THE FRENCH REP (CHEVRIER) QUESTIONED WHETHER  
THE ECONADS WAS THE PROPER VENUE FOR A DISCUSSION  
OF THE UNIVERSALITY, OR OTHERWISE, OF INVITATION  
LISTS FOR CSCE-RELATED, MULTILATERAL GATHERINGS,  
AND SUGGESTED THAT THIS MORE GENERAL POINT SHOULD  
BE DEALT WITH IN THE POLADS. THE CANADIAN REP  
ACKNOWLEDGED THE FRENCH CONCERN AND SAID THIS  
ISSUE HAD BEEN DISCUSSED WITHIN HIS DELEGATION  
WHEN OTTAWA'S INSTRUCTIONS HAD BEEN RECEIVED.  
HE AGREED THAT THE MATTER MIGHT ALSO BE DIS-  
CUSSED IN THE POLADS, AND ASSUMED THAT IT WOULD  
BE A MATTER FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN NATIONAL  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08     STATE 179813

MEMBERS OF THE TWO COMMITTEES. THE DANISH REP  
ASKED THAT FOR THE MOMENT, UNTIL SOME RESOLUTION  
HAD BEEN ACHIEVED WITH REGARD TO THE DANISH  
PROPOSAL, ALL ASPECTS OF THAT PROPOSAL BE  
HANDLED PRIMARILY IN THE ECONADS. HE SAID HE

WOULD REPORT THE UK AND CANADIAN COMMENTS BACK  
TO COPENHAGEN AND HOPED TO HAVE FURTHER IN-  
STRUCTIONS IN TIME FOR THE JULY 22 ECONADS  
MEETING.

6. ACTION REQUESTED: (A) DEPARTMENT PLEASE  
REPEAT REFTELS TO THOSE ADDRESSEE POSTS NOT ON  
ORIGINAL ROUTINGS.

(B) FURTHER GUIDANCE IN  
THE LIGHT OF THE APPARENTLY PRE-EMPTIVE UK  
PROPOSAL FOR AN ECE SYMPOSIUM ON THE ARCTIC AND OF  
THE CANADIAN SUGGESTIONS FOR "REGULARIZING"  
INVITATION PRACTICES ON CSCE-RELATED MULTILATERAL  
MEETINGS. WE DO NOT BELIEVE WE SHOULD ATTEMPT  
TO REACT TO THE CANADIAN STATEMENT BY THE JULY  
22 MEETING, HOWEVER. THE IMMEDIATE QUESTION  
MAY BECOME MOOT IF, BECAUSE OF THE UK ECE  
PROPOSAL, THE DANES DECIDE NOT TO PROCEED WITH  
THEIRS. STRAUSSZ-HUPE

UNQUOTE. KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 15 SEP 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, CONSTRUCTION, MEETINGS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 20 JUL 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** ellisoob  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976STATE179813  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:**  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** D760279-1126  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t197607109/baaaepkk.tel  
**Line Count:** 349  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 7  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** ellisoob  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 07 APR 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <07 APR 2004 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <19 AUG 2004 by ellisoob>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** ECONADS: DISCUSSION OF DANISH PROPOSAL FOR ARCTIC CONSTRUCTION SYMPOSIUM  
**TAGS:** ECON, SENV, DA, XQ, CSCE, ECE, NATO  
**To:** n/a INFO OSLO  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006